

REMARKS

Summary of Status of Claims

Prior to entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 54-56 and 63-70 were pending in the application with Claims 54 and 63 being independent claims. Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, new Claims 71-74 have been added and Claims 54-56 and 63-74 are pending with Claims 54m 63, 71 and 73 being independent claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 54-56 and 63-70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Shimada et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0021311) (hereinafter, the "Shimada" reference).

Claims 54-56 and 63-70 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Matsunoshita (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0179412) (hereinafter, the "Matsunoshita" reference).

The Office Action states that the Matsunoshita reference and the Shimada reference each disclose additional information. More specifically, the Office Action states that the additional information in the Matsunoshita reference is a randomly arranged dot pattern image. Office Action, page 2. The Office Action states that the additional information in the Shimada reference is line number and density setting information. Office Action, Page 4. The claims have been amended to more clearly define additional information as "binary additional information composed of bit value (0 or 1)" which is shown in the figures and described in the specification, for example, see Fig. 7 and accompanying text.

The Matsunoshita reference, the Shimada reference or the combination of the Matsunoshita reference and the Shimada reference do not teach or suggest, *inter alia*, inputting means for inputting area-assignment information that defines latent-image area and background area and binary additional information composed of bit values (0 or 1) or attaching the binary additional information to at least the latent image area by moving at least the arranged second dots such

that it can be determined whether an image on a printed material is an original because the binary additional information can be extracted from the original image based on the positions of the moved second dots and predetermined positions in the latent-image area, and the binary additional information cannot be extracted from a copy, each second dot being moved from the predetermined position along a direction which is defined by a bit value at a corresponding bit position in the binary additional information composed of bit values (0 or 1) as required by Claim 54.

Accordingly, Claim 54 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 63 and 66 include similar features to Claim 54 and are believed allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 54.

The Matsuonoshita reference, the Shimada reference or the combination of the Matsunoshita reference and the Shimada reference do not teach or suggest, *inter alia*, an inputting unit capable of inputting patterned image data, which includes first dots of a first dot size at determined positions in a background area and second dots of a second dot size that is a smaller dot size than the first dot size at determined positions in a latent-image area, the first dots being easily reproducible when copied and the second dots not being easily reproducible when copied, each of the second dots in the patterned image data being moved from the determined position along a direction which is determined by a bit value at a corresponding bit position in binary additional information; an extracting unit configured to extract the binary additional information from the binary additional information of the input image data; an outputting unit configured to output the extracted binary additional information as digital data; and a determining unit configured to determine whether the input image is original or not according to the output digital data as required by new Claim 71.

Accordingly, Claim 71 is believed to be allowable.

Claim 73 includes similar features to Claim 71 and is believed allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 71.

All of the remaining pending claims are dependent claims. As described above, all of the independent claims are believed allowable. As such, the claims

depending therefrom are also believed allowable. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, individual consideration of each on its own merit is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims pending in the application meet the requirements for patentability and respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate the allowance of such claims.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account Number 502456.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner may contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

October 30, 2007

/Marlene Klein/

Date

Marlene Klein, Reg. No. 43,718
Patent Attorney for Applicant

Canon U.S.A. Inc., Intellectual Property Division
15975 Alton Parkway
Irvine, CA 92618-3731

Telephone: (949) 932-3132
Fax: (949) 932-3560